UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,990	06/29/2001	Michelle D. Campbell	END920010033US1	5668

			EXAMINER
5409	7590	05/26/2004	GODDARD, BRIAN D

ARLEN L. OLSEN
SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS
3 LEAR JET LANE
SUITE 201
LATHAM, NY 12110

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/893,990	CAMPBELL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Brian Goddard	2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 June 2001*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-55* is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-55* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 June 2001* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
       application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

1.   Claims 1-2, 26-27 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,681,229 to Cason et al.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art

under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome

either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in

the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the

invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Referring to claim 1, Cason discloses the system for generating a report as

claimed. See Figures 16-17 and the corresponding portions of Cason's specification for

this disclosure. Cason teaches "a system [See Figs. 16-17] for generating a report [See

disclosures of SAP 382 in reference to Figs. 3 & 16] by a reporting tool of a SAP

business information system [382] using data included within an Aspect file [Catalog

Flat File 314], said system comprising a non-SAP bridge program [Not Numbered –

program code on Supplier System 300 (See Column 15, lines 33-48)] adapted to

generate [Step 312] the Aspect file through use of data derived from a dataset [Supplier

Source Data 310] and to transmit [Step 316] the Aspect file to the SAP business

information system [See Fig. 16]" as claimed.

Referring to claim 2, Cason discloses the system for generating a report as

claimed. See Figures 16-17 and the corresponding portions of Cason's specification for

this disclosure. Cason teaches the system of claim 1, as above, wherein the dataset

[310] is a non-SAP-formatted dataset [See Column 15, lines 42-46] as claimed.

Claims 26-27 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1-2 respectively. See the

discussions regarding claims 1-2 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claim 53 is rejected on the same basis as claim 1. See the discussion regarding

claim 1 above for the details of this disclosure.

2.   Claims 1-2, 26-27 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) because the

applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter. As shown above, the claimed

invention is fully disclosed by Cason, indicating that applicants did not themselves

invent the claimed subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4.   Claims 1-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033317 to Ziglin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,585 to Hendricks et al.

Referring to claim 1, Ziglin discloses a system for generating a report by a reporting tool of an enterprise system as claimed. See Figures 9-15 and the corresponding portions of Ziglin's specification for this disclosure. Ziglin teaches a system [See Figs. 12 & 15] for generating a report [See e.g. ¶ 0035] by a reporting tool of an enterprise business information system [132] using data included within an Aspect file [134 (Also See ¶ 0037)], said system comprising a non-enterprise bridge program [Layering Program 118] adapted to generate the Aspect file through use of data derived from a dataset [96] and to transmit the Aspect file [See Fig. 12] to the enterprise business information system.

Ziglin does not expressly state that the enterprise business information system is a SAP business information system, as claimed, because Ziglin is silent on a particular type of business information system used in the preferred embodiments. However, Ziglin does show that the enterprise business information system could be any of those available to an enterprise, and provides examples of some major enterprise business information systems in the Background of the Invention section (See ¶ 0006). This provides direct suggestion for using SAP as the enterprise business information system within Ziglin's invention.

Hendricks discloses a system and method similar to that of Ziglin, wherein formatted data is submitted to a SAP business information system for report generation as claimed. See Figure 4 and the corresponding portion of Hendricks' specification, specifically column 21, line 8 – column 22, line 13, for the details of this disclosure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Ziglin's enterprise business information system as a SAP business information system, such as that disclosed by Hendricks, to obtain the invention as claimed. One would have been motivated to do so because of the direct suggestion provided by Ziglin, as above.

Referring to claims 2 and 3, the system of Ziglin in view of Hendricks as applied to claim 1 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figure 12 and the corresponding portion of Ziglin's specification, as well as the above-mentioned portions of Hendricks' specification, for the details of this disclosure. Ziglin v. Hendricks teaches the system of claim 1, as above, wherein the dataset [96] can be a non-SAP-formatted

dataset [relational or non-relational dataset in need of conversion to the enterprise

(SAP) format] or a SAP-formatted dataset [already in the enterprise (SAP) format, but in

need of filtering] as claimed.

Referring to claim 4, the system of Ziglin in view of Hendricks as applied to claim

1 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figure 4 and the corresponding

portions of Hendricks' specification, in light of the discussion regarding claim 1 above.

Ziglin v. Hendricks teaches the system of claim 1, as above, wherein the SAP business

information system comprises an SAP Executive Information System (EIS) [Hendricks:

column 21, line 8 – column 22, line 13] as claimed.

Referring to claim 5, the system of Ziglin in view of Hendricks as applied to claim

1 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 12 & 15 and the

corresponding portions of Ziglin's specification, as well as Figures 4 & 29 and the

corresponding portions of Hendricks' specification, for this disclosure. Ziglin v.

Hendricks teaches a system for generating a report by a reporting tool of a SAP

business information system [See claim 1 above] using data included within an Aspect

file [Ziglin: 134; Hendricks: Matrix] having rollup records [Hendricks: programs watched

elements (See column 70, lines 40-56)], said system comprising a non-SAP bridge

program adapted to generate the Aspect file through use of data derived from a dataset

and to transmit the Aspect file to the SAP business information system [See claim 1

above], said dataset having a keygroup [Hendricks: program category], wherein to

generate the Aspect file includes to roll up [Hendricks: Step 430] a portion of the dataset

with respect to the keygroup, wherein each rollup record has a rollup field [Hendricks:

program category name/title (e.g. sports, news, movies, etc.)] and a quantity field

[Hendricks: count], wherein the rollup field stores a rollup keyvalue of the keygroup, and

wherein the quantity field stores the number of dataset records that have the same

rollup keyvalue [Hendricks: See column 70, lines 40-56 & Fig. 29] as claimed.

Referring to claim 6, the system of Ziglin in view of Hendricks as applied to claim

5 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 12 & 15 and the

corresponding portions of Ziglin's specification, as well as Figures 4 & 29 and the

corresponding portions of Hendricks' specification, for this disclosure. Ziglin v.

Hendricks teaches the system of claim 5, as above, wherein the bridge program is

further adapted to cause the rollup records in the generated Aspect file [See above] to

be sorted with respect to the keygroup [Hendricks: See column 70, line 57 et seq.] as

claimed.

Claims 7-8 are rejected on the same basis as claims 2-3, in light of the basis for

claim 5. See the discussions regarding claims 1-3 & 5 above for the details of this

disclosure.

Referring to claim 9, the system of Ziglin in view of Hendricks as applied to claim

5 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 12 & 15 and the

corresponding portions of Ziglin's specification, as well as Figures 4 & 29 and the

corresponding portions of Hendricks' specification, for this disclosure. Ziglin v.

Hendricks teaches the system of claim 5, as above, wherein the bridge program is

further adapted to generate a trace file [Hendricks: target sequence] that includes a

representative rollup keyvalue [Hendricks: highest priority weighted group] of the

keygroup and a pointer that points to a portion of the dataset, said portion being

correlated with the representative rollup keyvalue [Hendricks: See column 70, line 57 et

seq.] as claimed.

Claim 10 is rejected on the same basis as claim 4, in light of the basis for claim 5.

See the discussions regarding claims 1, 4 and 5 above for the details of this disclosure.

Referring to claims 11 and 12, the system of Ziglin in view of Hendricks as

applied to claim 5 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 12 & 15 and

the corresponding portions of Ziglin's specification, as well as Figures 4 & 29 and the

corresponding portions of Hendricks' specification, for this disclosure. Ziglin v.

Hendricks teaches the system of claim 5, as above, wherein the bridge program is

further adapted to identify select records [Ziglin: ¶ 0035; Hendricks: Column 40, lines

44-56 & Column 70, line 40 – Column 71, line 10] of the dataset in accordance with at

least one selection rule [Ziglin: key value(s); Hendricks: date/time constraints] applied to

the dataset, and wherein the portion of the dataset includes the select records so

identified, wherein to identify the select records includes to accept as input a first date

and a second date [Hendricks: Column 40, lines 44-56 & Column 70, line 40 – Column

71, line 10], wherein the first date is earlier than the second date, and wherein the

selection rules do not permit identifying as a select record any record of the dataset

having an effective date that is earlier than the first date or later than the second date

[only records between the dates/times are selected] as claimed.

Referring to claim 13, the system of Ziglin in view of Hendricks as applied to

claim 5 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 12 & 15 and the

corresponding portions of Ziglin's specification, as well as Figures 4 & 29 and the

corresponding portions of Hendricks' specification, for this disclosure. Ziglin v.

Hendricks teaches the system of claim 5, as above, wherein the dataset is a table [in

database 96] as claimed.

Referring to claims 14 and 15, the system of Ziglin in view of Hendricks as

applied to claim 5 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 12 & 15 and

the corresponding portions of Ziglin's specification, as well as Figures 4 & 29 and the

corresponding portions of Hendricks' specification, for this disclosure. Ziglin v.

Hendricks teaches the system of claim 5, as above, wherein the report relates to

procurement data [See below], wherein the rollup records include the procurement data

[See the above cited portions of Ziglin & Hendricks], and wherein the procurement data

is selected from the group consisting of purchase order data, invoice data, and a

combination thereof [See the Background, Summary, and Detailed Descriptions of both

Ziglin and Hendricks] as claimed.

Referring to claim 16, the system of Ziglin in view of Hendricks as applied to

claim 11 above discloses the invention as claimed. See the discussions regarding

claims 5 and 11 above, as well as the portions of Ziglin and Hendricks cited therein, for

the details of this disclosure. Ziglin's (as modified by Hendricks) system uses data from

N [multiple] Aspect files created from N datasets for generating a report [See Fig. 12 &

corresponding portion of Ziglin's specification and the above cited portions of Hendricks]

as claimed.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected on the same basis as claims 2-3 respectively, in light of the basis for claim 16. See the discussions regarding claims 1-3, 5, 11 and 16 above for the details of this disclosure.

Referring to claims 19-22, the system of Ziglin in view of Hendricks as applied to claim 16 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 12 & 15 and the corresponding portions of Ziglin's specification, as well as Figures 4 & 29 and the corresponding portions of Hendricks' specification, for this disclosure. Ziglin's (as modified by Hendricks) bridge program(s) [118] transforms datasets of multiple, different formats [any format] to create the Aspect files as claimed.

Claim 23 is rejected on the same basis as claim 4, in light of the basis for claim 16. See the discussions regarding claims 1, 4-5, 11 and 16 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 24 and 25 are rejected on the same basis as claims 14 and 15 respectively, in light of the basis for claim 16. See the discussions regarding claims 5 and 14-16 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 26-29 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1-4 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 1-4 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 30-40 are rejected on the same basis as claims 5-15 respectively. See the discussions regarding claims 5-15 above for the details of this disclosure.

Referring to claim 41, the system and method of Ziglin in view of Hendricks as applied to claim 30 above discloses the invention as claimed. See Figures 12 & 15 and the corresponding portions of Ziglin's specification, as well as Figures 4 & 29 and the

corresponding portions of Hendricks' specification, for this disclosure. Ziglin v.

Hendricks teaches the method of claim 30, as above, further comprising:

transmitting the Aspect file to the SAP business information system [See above]

where the Aspect file becomes a Temp file [for the Enterprise (SAP) Solution

Applications 132 to process] having rollup records [See above];

making a query to sum over the quantity field for a subset of the rollup records of

the Temp file [Hendricks: Column 70, line 40 – Column 71, line 10], wherein the subset

is determined by the query, and wherein the query is adapted to being executed by a

SAP module in the SAP computing environment; and

executing the query by the SAP module including returning a result of the query

[See above cited portions of both Ziglin & Hendricks] as claimed.

Claims 42-51 are rejected on the same basis as claims 16-25 respectively. See

the discussions regarding claims 16-25 above for the details of this disclosure.

Claim 52 is rejected on the same basis as claim 41, in light of the basis for claim

42 above. See the discussions regarding claims 41-42 for the details of this disclosure.

Claims 53-55 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1, 5 and 16 respectively.

See the discussions regarding claims 1, 5 and 16 above for the details of this

disclosure.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent Application Nos. 2002/0107864 to Battas et al. and 2001/0002470 to Inohara et al. are both considered particularly pertinent to applicants' claimed invention.

The remaining prior art of record is considered pertinent to applicants' disclosure, and/or portions of applicants' claimed invention.

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Goddard whose telephone number is 703-305-7821. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9 AM - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bdg
20 May 2004

SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100